

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. In the final Office Action dated October 16, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Devine, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0095399)* (“*Devine*”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and addresses the Examiner’s disposition below.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10 have been amended. Claims 4 and 8 have been canceled.

Independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 each have been amended to clarify that the processing engines are in-memory processing engines. Further, claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 have been amended to clarify that a solution to a problem is determined by:

- a first processing engine subscribing to and receiving a first datatype, performing a first processing on a data associated with the first datatype, and publishing a first processing result as a second datatype, and

- a second processing engine subscribing to and receiving the second datatype, performing a second processing on the processed data associated with the second datatype to determine the solution to the problem, and publishing the solution as a third datatype.

Thus, Applicant’s claimed invention uses horizontally-scaled in-memory processing engines to solve problems. A first processing engine processes data to yield a first processing result, and then a second processing engine arrives at a solution to the problem using the first processing result from the first processing engine.

This is clearly unlike *Devine*, which fails to disclose or suggest determining a solution to a problem by a first in-memory processing engine yielding a first result and then a second in-memory processing engine arriving at a solution to the problem using the first processing result from the first processing engine. *Devine* teaches that connected devices (CDs) can communicate via a network. The connected devices can provide services for Retrieval, Analysis, and Reporting (RAR). These services may receive, as input, the output of another service. For example, an Analysis service can receive, as an input, the output of a Retrieval service. *Devine* [0056].

Unlike Applicant’s claimed invention, nowhere does *Devine* teach, or even suggest, determining a solution to a problem by using two Analysis services, wherein one Analysis service uses the output of another Analysis service to arrive at the solution. Instead, *Devine* merely teaches that one type of service (Retrieval, Analysis, or Reporting) can receive, as an input, the output of another type of service. *Devine* [0056]. Further, *Devine* teaches that there can be a plurality of each

type of service, and that each type of service can receive multiple inputs from other types of services (e.g., a Reporting service can receive inputs from two Analysis services as well as an input from a Retrieval service). However, nowhere does *Devine* suggest the horizontal scalability of one of its service types. In particular, *Devine* fails to disclose or suggest horizontal scalability of Analysis services. *Devine*'s Analysis services only feed outputs to Retrieval and Reporting services, not to other Analysis services.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that if one would argue that *Devine* suggests horizontal scalability of its Analysis services, the argument would be based on impermissible hindsight after having viewed Applicant's claimed invention. This is because, *Devine* fails to relate to solving problems using horizontally-scaled processing engines.

For at least these reasons, *Devine* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 5, 9, and 10.

Claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 5 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 5 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-10 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher P. Rauch/ (Reg. No. 45,034)

Christopher P. Rauch

SONNENSCHNEIDER, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box #061080

Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower

Chicago, IL 60606-1080

Telephone 312/876-2606

Customer #58328

Attorneys for Applicant(s)